

SUPPLEMENT

ANSWER

Mr. CLENDON

HIS

Traſtatus Philoſophico-Theologicus.

OR, A

Treatiſe of the Word PERSON.

*Bleſſed is the Man that hath not Walk'd in the Council of the
Ungodly; nor ſtood in the Way of Sinners; and hath not ſat
in the Seat of the Scornful. Pſal. i.*

LONDON, Printed M DCC X.

PREFACE

THE Censure of this Book of Mr. Clendon's by the Parliament, with the Order for his being Prosecuted for it, shews how much he has Mistaken his Text the Act of Parliament, which he took for his Foundation of the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity.

This might have Saved my Pains as to the Explanation of that Act. But these Papers were Wrote (all to Sect. x.) before the late Tryal of Dr. Sacheverell, which Occasion'd that Sentance upon Mr. Clendon, among other Blasphemous Writers of the Age.

My Publishing them now, is that Sort of Persecution which only I have aimed at, to Convert if I can, if not, to Confute these Enemies of Christianity. If the latter be the Case, it will be a Greater Mortification to Men Conceited of their own Wit, than any Legal Penalties. And they are Apt to say, That this is all the Confutation can be given them, and to Glory in their Confessorship to the Vilest of Heresies!

This then is to Disarm Mr. Clendon and the Rest of his Socinian Accomplices of that Sort of Triumph. If it have not the Happier Effect of Inducing them to Repentance. Which is the Victory I desire over them. And I Pray heartily for them, that God would Open their Eyes, and let them see His Glory in the Face of Jesus Christ. To whom be all Honour, Might, Majesty, and Dominion, from all Creatures, Converted Sinners especially, Now and for Ever. Amen.

CON-



CONTENTS

- I. **W**HY this goes as a Supplement. 1
- II. His Socinian Treatment of me. He Scorns to Answer me. 2
 1. Yet Answers. His Proof of Tritheism against me. *ib.*
 2. He argues Logically from what is but Allusion. *ibid*
 3. I argued from the Holy Scriptures, and the Ante-Nicene Fathers. 3
 4. He brings other Texts, which he says do not Prove. *ibid*
- III. He throws at all the Scriptures, like the Ancient Hereticks. *ibid*
- IV. He Attacks and Defies the Catholick Church, Councils, and Creeds. 4
 1. He excludes all Gentile Converts from Christianity. *ibid*
 2. The genuine Scriptures Vindicated against his false Scriptures. 5
 3. His Contempt of St. John, and how he Corrupts Joh. 3. 26. *ibid*
- V. He makes the Trinity an Invention of Plato's. 6
 1. The Texts out of the Old Testament spoil this. *ib.*
 2. The Socinians say, it arose from the Mistake of some Texts of Scripture, and could not be the meer Invention of any Man. *ibid*
 3. The Heathens had it from the Old Testament. *ibid*
 4. Forgetting Plato, he makes the Jews the first who brought it into Reveal'd Religion. 7
- VI. His Mish-mash Philosophy. *ibid*
- VII. His Exquisite Notion of the Word Person. 8
 1. He can make 100 Persons of one Man. *ibid*
 2. His Excellent Latinity from Cicero. 9
 3. He will not let a Man be the same Person with Himself, tho' he may be 20 other Persons. 10
 4. He Blasphemes God and the Queen, making her an Emblem of the Trinity. *ibid*
 5. He knows not the Difference betwixt Substance and Accident. *ibid*
 6. This Answers all his Book. 11

CONTENTS.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>7. He makes the Queen Drop one of her three Persons by the Union. And so he thinks God may. <i>ibid</i></p> <p>8. The Horrid Affront he offers to the Queen and the Noble Lords to whom he Dedicates this. <i>ibid</i></p> <p>9. He may make 1000 Persons of the Queen, by his Arguments, and as many of God. 12</p> <p>10. He makes every Manifestation to be a Person. <i>ib.</i></p> <p>11. And the Action to be the Actor. His Modalities of Accidents. 13</p> <p>12. His Folly in Applying this to God. 14</p> <p>13. To make His Personalities Analogous to those of Men. <i>ibid</i></p> <p>14. Yet he will not Suffer any such Expressions in Others. 15</p> <p>15. His Personality of Ubi.</p> <p>16. His Dumbfoundering. 16</p> <p>VIII. He rebuts the Doctrine of the Trinity upon an Act of Parliament of K. William. <i>ibid</i></p> <p>1. Which he makes as Infalible as the H. Scriptures.</p> <p>2. Excluding the Bishops. 17</p> <p>3. He makes ours a Parliamentary Religion. <i>ibid</i></p> | <p>4. Yet he is no Papist. <i>ib.</i></p> <p>5. Lenity is only in Lay-Legislation. <i>ibid</i></p> <p>6. The Clergy are Stanty Guides in Religion. 18</p> <p>7. He complements the Church of England out of the Catholick Church. <i>ibid</i></p> <p>8. He plainly Incurs the Penalty of his own Act of Parliament. <i>ibid</i></p> <p>9. And is Damned by the Church of England. 19</p> <p>10. He makes himself an Atheist. <i>ibid</i></p> <p>11. He is Whigg and Low-Church. 20</p> <p>12. He Vindicates A. B. Tilloston. B. Pattrick. The present A. B. of Cant. and B. of Sarum, for being suspected of Socinianism. <i>ib.</i></p> <p>13. He Claws off Mr. Hill very Wittily, for Writing against the B. of Sarum. 21</p> <p>14. And answers the Animadverter upon his Lordship with a Ha-ha-ha. 22</p> <p>IX. Words alter their Meaning by Disputes. <i>ibid</i></p> <p>X. He plays Fast and Loose with them. <i>ibid</i></p> <p>A Summary Account of the Design of my Dialogues, and of the Answers made to them. 23</p> |
|--|--|



A

SUPPLEMENT IN ANSWER TO Mr. CLENDON.

(1) **S**ince the foregoing Sheets were Printed off, an Old *Socinian* in the Temple has enter'd the Lists against me. I therefore stopt the Publication of them, till I had read over this *Tardulus*, Intituled *Tractatus Philosophico—Theologicus de Persona*, or, *A Treatise of the Word PERSON*, by John Clendon of the Inner Temple Esq; Printed for John Walshoe, in the Middle-Temple Cloisters,

1710. To find whether there were any New Matter in this, which should require a Distinct Answer by it self; or that it might be Dispatch'd in a Supplement to what goes before. And I easily Determin'd to the Latter, for tho' it is a large Book of 224 Pages, besides two Epistles Dedicatory, and one to the Reader, all the Sense, or Argument in it might be put into a Nut-Shell. Nor had I thought it Worthy of any Notice, but that

that it seems the last Effort, and Exposes this Baff'd Cause even to Contempt. And because I heard some lay Stress upon it, and say it had gain'd a *Vogue* about the Town.

theism by this Strong Argument, Now, what Plainer and more Impudent *Trisheism* than this, can be Asserted by Man?—Surely Nothing can be More. And thus it is Proved!

(II.) In the beginning of his *Epistle to the Reader* he falls upon me with a great deal of *Wit*, calling me *Brute*, and such like Names for a whole Page together, and Concludes, that my *Socinianism* *Discus'd* is not Worth Answering, and that he *Scorns* to Answer it!

(1.) Yet he gives one Stroke at me, and Quotes my Fourth *Dialogue*, p. 11. where I brought an *Allusion*, that God is Named in the Creed as a *Nature* or *Species* to *Individuals*, and then that the three *Persons* are Named, the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*, whence he wou'd Infer that I meant God to be a *Species*, and the three *Persons* to be really and truly *Individuals* in a *Strict* and *Proper Sense*; tho' I have frequently through these *Dialogues* Gaurded against any *Allusions* to God being so taken; and here I Word it with an *As*, to shew it was but an *Allusion*. As it is Express'd *Dialogue* II. p. 4. *as it were* a *Species*. Yet he takes no Notice, but Proves it to be *Tri-*

(2.) I have told you often (but you will not mind) that God is neither *Genus*, nor *Species*, nor *Individual*, nor *Person*, in the Sense these Words are taken, and as they are Us'd among Men. And therefore that we must not Argue *Strictly* from them with Relation to God, nor Infer *Contradictions* from them in God, because we find it so among Men. For these are only *Allusions*, not *Proper Words* as to God, tho' the Best we have. As when God is called *Light*, if we shou'd argue *Strictly* from thence, what *Contradictions* might we find? Yet this is the whole *Socinian* Topick, to find *Contradictions* in the *Trinity* of God, from the Acceptation of the Word *Persons* as apply'd to Men. How often have I told the *Remarker* upon my *Dialogues* of this? And he was forced to yield my Observation to be Just, and that it was no fair way of Argument, and pretended he did not do it. Yet they cannot refrain it. Here is now come out a whole Book *de Persona*. And all, as it is apply'd to Men,

Men,

Men, by *Orators* and *Logicians*. And thence Mr. Clendon musters up his Arguments against the *Trinity*, applying the Word *Persons* to God the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, in the same Manner as to *Peter*, *James*, and *John*.

(3.) The *Socinians* pretended to the *Scriptures*. And published their *Brief History* of the *Unitarians* upon most of the *Texts* from *Genesis* to the *Revelations*, which are usually brought for the *Doctrine* of the *Holy Trinity*. They likewise asserted that the *Fathers* before the first Council of *Nice* were on their side. In answer to both which Pretences, I published these *Dialogues*, and upon most, if not all of these *Texts*, I not only argue from the general and known Acceptation of the Words, Supported by other Parallel *Texts*, but give the Interpretation of the *Fathers* before the first Council of *Nice* upon each *Text* Controverted, and shewed them to be intirely on the *Christian* side of the Question, and against the Misrepresentation of the *Unitarians*, or *Socinians*.

(4.) Now when I saw this great Book come out against me, and begin with my *Dialogues*, I thought to have found

some Reply to these Things. But all the Notice he takes of them is in his p. 62, 63. Where he Quotes a few other *Texts* which I had not named, and says, that these he names do not prove the thing.

(III.) But p. 56. he throws at all our *Scriptures* as deficient, and says, *The Gospel* of the twelve *Apostles*, and other *Writings* of those *Holy Men*, were most of them either rejected as *Spurious*, or suppressed, or otherwise *Apocryphated*. And those few only were allowed of as *Canonical*, which were of such *Necessity* that they could not be concealed, and which remain now to us at this Day. This was one necessary piece of Artifice they used. This *They* was the Church, which he bespatters every where and here accuses of vitiating, concealing, and rejecting the true *Scriptures*. By which he means those false *Gospels* and other *Pseudo-Scriptures*, which the Predecessors of the *Socinians* had forged in those early times, to support the same *Heresy*. This I shewed in the same *Fourth Dialogue* he quotes, but four Leaves after, what he Quotes, p. 20, 21. And tell from *Eusebius* and *Theodoret* how these *Hereticks*, then called *Nazarens*, were detected in forging new *Scriptures*, and

corrupting the old, which some of them had the Impudence to own, and called it *Mending the Scriptures*; others of them rejected the Law and the Prophets, and others other Parts of the Holy Scriptures, as they thought fit. But of this Mr. Clendon takes no Notice (may be he never read it) but trumps up again the Pretences of these condemn'd Hereticks, in Opposition to the whole Catholick Church which he despises, as I come to shew more fully.

(IV.) In his Dedication to the Lord Chancellor, he says, p. 9. *My Lord, I have had no Regard to Fathers or School-Men, nor to Councils or their Creeds.* And in his Book, p. 170. he says, *The Notions of God of God, and God the Son, and God as the Son of God, is what we have from the Fathers and their Philosophy, and not from Revelation.* And p. 173, 174. *And this hath been the Doctrine of the Schools and the Catholick Church hitherto — And since the Animadverter had swallow'd thus much, which doubtless he did upon the Authority of the Catholick Church, and so never consider'd it —* p. 175. *And this Doctrine of the School-Men and Catholick Church — must be utterly Impracticable, &c.* p. 194. *Nor ought we in this Case*

to be fobb'd off with Mystery, nor with the Authority of the Church. And what Church is it they mean at last, do you think? Even the Catholick Church. And p. 195. *'Tis the Catholick Church they are so fond of, for the Support of whose Authority forsooth, we must be kept in Ignorance, all they can, and the Truth conceal'd from us.* Again, p. 215. *The three Hypostases of the Fathers, construed three Substances and three Persons by the Schools, is the Doctrine of the Catholick Church. And so it is in many other things. All this ado is to support the Authority of a Catholick Church.* The Reader (if any other but my self, must undergo that Penance) will find abundance of the like Contempt of the Catholick Church throughout this tedious Book. And I suppose others will be content with what is here produced.

(1.) But it is not only in Words he expresses his Rage against the Catholick Church, he gives his Reason, and excludes all Gentiles from Christianity. He allows none to be true Christians, or to have had the Faith, but the Jewish Converts only, and these he supposes to be extinguish'd in the Reign of Adrian the Emperor; after which he says, the Gentiles came in and corrupted the Faith,

Faith, And they were fain to bid a perpetual Adieu to the true Apostolick Doctrine of our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ. Thus he expresses it, p. 51. And again, p. 69. he repeats it again, and says, "After Adrian's time, when the Christians of the Circumcision were wholly extirpated with the Jews, and no Bishops to be but of the Gentiles, the Christians became no more than another Sect in Philosophy. They called themselves Christians indeed, but as Melito there says, their Doctrines were the same Philosophy that had been among the Ethnicks. And p. 70. Thus it was (says he) that the Old Evangelick Apostolick Doctrines concerning our Saviour were Lost. And how has Father Clendon found them again? In Simon Magus, Cerinthus, Sabellius, and Novinus, and in the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles and other Writings of those Holy Men, which have been Lost these 1500 Years."

(2.) He says (as I have before Quoted him) that it was One Necessary piece of Artifice the Church us'd, to Admit none of these Holy Writings into the Canon of the Scripture, but those few only which were of such Notoriety that they could not be Gain-said. And was not

this an Honest Artifice, to Admit nothing Dubious into the Canon? But they were not Dubious, for, as I Quoted Eusebius in my Fourth Dialogue, p. 21. there were Notorious Marks of Imposture upon those he calls Holy Writings which were set up by these Hereticks in the Names of the Apostles, as that all the Copies they produc'd were in their own Hands; and they cou'd shew no Original whence they were Transcrib'd; and that even the Copies which went about among them did not Agree with one another.

(3.) But he says that those Books in the Canon are a Few only. And yet he thinks they are too Many. I have taken Notice before how the Socinians have Endeavour'd to Invalidate several Books of Holy Scripture, particularly all the Writings of St. John, because he speaks most Expressly of the Trinity and Divinity of Christ, he having Wrote the Latest of any of the Apostles, and after Cerinthus and others had Broach'd their Heresies against Both these Doctrines. And Mr. Clendon does not Conceal his Contempt of St. John, He calls him Poor St. John. p. 75. And says of him, p. 42. The good Evangelist was not Skill'd in their Philosophy, and so was not a Match for them. Again p. 46. He, good Man,

Man, Notwithstanding his great Age, for the Peace of the Church, Undertakes to Write. And to Help out this Poor Old Man, Mr. Clendon Ventures to Mend his Text for him! As you will see p. 33. where instead of our Literal Translation of Job. v. 26. *As the Father hath Life in Himself, so hath He given (Esau) to the Son to have Life in Himself.* Mr. Clendon renders it thus, *So shall he given to the Son, &c.* that is, in the Socinian Notion, that it should be given him after his Resurrection, but not that He had Life in Himself before. It is frequent with the Socinians to take this Liberty with the Texts of Scripture, as I have shewed in many Instances in my Dialogues.

(V.) Mr. Clendon having thus made bold with the Scriptures, and quite thrown off the Catholick Church, let us see what Foundation he gives to the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and his Account how it came first into the World. With this he begins his Chap. ii. And makes it a mere Heathenish Invention. He Mentions the Texts or Trinity of Plato, consisting of the three Hypostases or Persons in the Deity, and that in these three Principles of Origination the whole or Fulness of the Deity did Consist, And this (lays he p. 24.) I

take it was the first Name that the World had of a Divine Trinity.

(1.) But, Mr. Clendon, those Texts out of the Old Testament which are Consider'd in my Second Dialogue were long before Plato. Therefore he might take it from them. It was impossible they could take it from him. And you should have Clear'd up these Texts better than I have done, before you had thus Confidently made Plato the Original of this Doctrine.

(2.) And what is now become of that Master Argument of the Socinians? That the Doctrine of the Trinity is Contradictory to all Common Sense and Reason; And brought in by the Christians upon their Mistake of some Texts of Scripture, which the Socinians pretend to Explain better. Yet now they wou'd make it the Invention of the Heathens, of their Principal and most Celebrated Philosophers, Men of the most Refin'd Reason; and that the Christians did Learn it from them!

(3.) But it was not the Invention of either Jew or Gentile. No Reason of Man could have Search'd so far into the Abyss of the Nature of God.

It

It was at the first made known to Man by Revelation. And it has Descended down through all Ages by Tradition; Chiefly of the Jews, who had the *Living Oracles* Committed unto them, wherein this Divine Mystery was Contain'd; And from whence, in all Probability, *Plato* and the most Acute of the Heathen Philosophers did take it, for the *Old Testament* was known unto them. And the *Fathers* of the Church did Quote the *Old Testament* for this Doctrine of the Trinity, (as appears by what I have Quoted of them upon the Texts of the *Old Testament*) not the Philosophers, or the *Cabala* of the Jews, as Mr. Clendon foolishly Imagins. I have Insisted upon this in my *Second Dialogue*, Sect. xv. N. 3, 4. But Mr. Clendon Repeats the Objection here over again, without taking any Notice of the Answers there given.

(4.) I have told before how Mr. Clendon throws off the *Greek Church* and the whole *Catholic Church* ever since the *Jewish Christians* were Extirpated in the Reign of *Adrian*, who only (he says) held the Faith uncorrupted: For that the *Greek* and *Gentile* Converts brought in the *Pagan Philosophy*, and Corrupted the *Christian Religion* by it. But forgetting this, he p. 27, 28. Makes the Jews the

first who took this Philosophy into *Reveal'd Religion*, and by this had Establish'd the Doctrine of the Trinity before Christianity began. And p. 28 he Quotes Mr. Dodwell shewing how *Moses* became of Authority among the *Gentile Philosophers*, and was Quoted by them, by the Name of *Ἰεσοῖς* the Prophet. They who advance New Systems, had need of good Memories.

(VI.) Well, but Mr. Clendon will have Philosophy to be the Corrupter of *Reveal'd Religion*, take it how you will. He says, p. 216. That the *Christian Doctrine* was Ecclipsed and Obscured by the darksom Cloud of these mish mash Doctrines of *Fathers* and *School Men*, which make up the Doctrine of the *Catholic Church*. And how does he set about to cure this? Even by entring into the very Dregs of this mish mash! His whole Book is nothing else but a fulsome and tedious Repetition of *Quoddities* and *Quiddities*, and shewing his Parts upon the Difference betwixt *Ens*, *Essence*, and *Existence*, betwixt *Substance* and *Subsistence*, *Accidents* and *Adjuncts*, *Suppositum*, *Person*, and *Personality*; besides *Modalities* and *Suppositualities*, &c. as different for all these! And out of this deep Fountain of Learning, he has extracted (as he

he thinks) the true Notion of the Word *Person*, which gives the Title to his Book, *de Persona*, or, *A Treatise of the Word PERSON*. And then he applies this to the Word *Persons* as used in Relation to the Holy Trinity, and crys *Essentia*. he has untied the Gordian Knot!

(VII.) Now let us see what he makes of this. This is the *Fugulum Cause*. And here you will find a Performance worthy of himself! He begins, p. 11. with giving the Definition of the Word *Person*, and of *Personality*. And this he makes to consist in whatever *Accidental* thing, distinguishes one Man from another, the Colour of his Hair, his *Phiz*, p. 13. his Features, Complexion, or Countenance, his Dress, p. 15, 16. Address, Mien, Deportment, &c. As likewise any accidental Accomplishment of the Mind, as Wisdom, Learning, Religion, &c. Of this sort of Accidents (says he) also are all Honours, Dignities, Offices, and Employments of Trust, Power or Profit, and the like. Every one of these he makes to be a *Personality* which does Constitute the *Person*.

(1.). And by the same Rule he says, p. 16. The same one

Man may be several Persons in those several Respects, viz. As he is a wise Man he may be one Person, as he is a learned Man another, and as he is a Religious Man another. And by the foresaid Description of *Phiz*, Mien, Dress, &c. when his Beard grows he is one Person, and when he is Shaved he is another; when he has a Black Coat on, he is one Person, and another Person when he has a colour'd Coat; he is different Persons when he looks Sour or Sweet, when he makes a Mouth, Walks, Dances, or stands still; when he Sleeps, Walks, &c. For these are several Personalities, and it is the Personality makes the Person. And hence it is (says he, p. 17.) that one particular Essence may from the several Personalities be as properly call'd several Persons, as several particular Essences, can from their several Personalities be several Persons. For that in the one Case as well as in the other, we contemplate the entire particular Essence in Conjunction with the Personality that makes the Person.

And so it is also of Personalities that result from Dignities, Offices, Professions, Employments, and the like. Her Majesty, the Queen of Great-Britain, as she is Queen of England, is one Person, as she is Queen of Scotland, she

She is another Person, and as she is Queen of Ireland, she is another Person.

(2.) " And for this (says he, p. 18.) I think I shall need no better Authority than *M. T. Cicero*, whom all must allow to be a Competent Judge of the Latin Tongue: 'Tis he that thus Expresseth himself viz. *Exuit homo Personam amici, quando induit Judicis*. And again, *Sustineo Unus tres Personas, Mei, Adversarii, Judicis*. And they are frequent Phrases in Latin Authors, viz. *Personam agere, Sustinere, Induere, Exuere Deponere*, &c. — So that *Persona*, as to the true Latinity of the Word — &c. Thus Mr. Clendon.

The Word *Latinity* here was well found out, for it Chimes more with the School Terminations of Identity, Substantiality, Personality, &c. than plain *Latin* would have done! But, Mr. Clendon, you needed not have gone so far for these Deep Observations, for even in the Englishity of the Word, to Personate another is taken in the same Sense, as when you Mimick another, or a Player Acts or Personates a Pedant upon the Stage, &c. Do's this Really make him another Person than he is? Do's he hereby become a Benchman of the Tem-

ple, or Reader at the Trumpet-Clubb?

(3.) You fall foul (p. 124.) upon Mr. Samuel Hill Rector of Killmington, as a zealous Defender of the Greek Fathers, as appears (say you) by a very Unmannerly Book he wrote some time since against the Bishop of SALISBURY. But what you have to say to him is touching his Notion of a Person. Which he thought he could Explain without your Cramp Words of *Suppositums, Subsistences*, &c. And says, as you Quote him, p. 138. That from that True, Vital, Substantial Union that is between the Soul and the Body results the Person of Peter, who is Compounded of Both. This you call a New Notion of a Person. Tho' I dare say it is the Commonest in England, and what every Man means by a Person, who is not so Book-Learned as Mr. Clendon! But you Ridicule it thus, p. 139.

" No need now of *Subsistence* or *Suppositum* to help out the Notion of a Person. Peter as Compounded of a Soul and Body by a Vital Union of Both, is a Sufficient Person. He can Eat and Drink, and Walk, and Understand, and that's a Person Sufficient.

But you Reply Smartly upon him, A Man Sufficient, good Mr.

C Examiner,

Examiner, but not a Person. So you Distinguish betwixt the *Man* and the *Person*. So that when *Peter* eats, drinks, &c. a *Man* eats and drinks, but not a *Person*. And why? *Personality* neither Eats nor Drinks. No, nor the *Mannality* neither. But *Peter* cannot be a *Man* without being likewise a *Person*. And the *Person* of *Peter* do's every thing that the *Man* of *Peter* can do. O Rare *Philosophy*! Is not this what you just now called *Mish Mash*? *Mr. Clendon*. And what Shameful Use do you make of it, to Confound common Sense and Manner of Speaking! You made so Slight of a *Person* before that a Pair of New Shoes made a New *Person*; And now you are so Strict that you will not let a *Man* be a *Person* with Himself, but thrust in *Personalities* and *Suppositalities* between them!

(4.) But you Stick close to your Parallel of the *Queen* and the *Trinity*, which I have Quoted. You are so Fond of it that you Repeat it again, p. 142. and say,

" Thus 'tis (as I instanc'd before) of the Triple Personality in the *Queen's Majesty*, with respect to the Triple Diadem she wears; in respect of one of them, She is one Compleat Per-

son; in respect of another, she is another Compleat Person; and in respect of the Third, she is a Third Person: And yet she is in herself but one Compleat, Individual, Numerical, Essence or Being.

But that it may be yet more Conspicuous, he puts it in again near the End of his *Epistle Dedicatory* to the Earl of *Sunderland*, thus, And really, My Lord, I would not Prophane the Deity to flatter the greatest and best Prince in the World. But I do think the *Queen's Majesty*, with respect to her three Kingdoms, to be a most apposite Emblem of the Personal Triplicity in the Divine Unity. She is in each respect a particular Person, and yet in every respect she is one and the same particular Royal Essence.

(5.) *Mr. Clendon*, will you let me *Philosophize* a little with you? Is *Royalty* an *Essence*? I took it for a *Personal* thing. But if it be of the *Essence*, then surely no *King* or *Queen* can either *Forfeit* or *Abdicate*. Unless you say, it is of the *Essence* of the *Personality*. And will that be good *Philosophy*? How then will *Essence* and *Personality* be Distinguish'd? Or has a *Man* as many *Essences* as he has *Personalities*? You have given him so many *Personalities*,

Personalities, that he cannot Continue one Person an Hour together, if he *Open* or *Shut* his *Mouth*, make a *Wry Face*, or *Alter* any thing of his *Phiz*, *Meen*, or *Dress*. And does he Lose one *Essence*, and Gain another, upon every one of these *Changes* of his *Person*? *Essence* is *Substance*, and the *Personalities* you have Named are *Accidents*, you call them so; tell me then what is the *Substance* of an *Accident*? And how then do they Differ?

(6.) If you call this *Cavelling*, I will Readily Grant it, for I know your Meaning. But then it will Answer all your Book. For the *Hypostases* of the *Greeks*, and *Persons* of the *Latin* and *English* mean the same thing, and they have sufficiently Explain'd themselves, not to mean *three Gods*. And all you have said against this, is such poor *Cavilling* upon *Words*, upon *Substance*, *Subsistence*, and *Accident* as I have now shewed you.

(7.) But to go on with your *Dedication*. You after Address the *Queen* by her *Secretary of State*, to give *Peace* to *Christianity* in this *Vexatious Point* of the *Trinity*. And how? Even by the great Instance of her *Royal Self*, as you have Explain'd her *Trinity*, and so put an end

to the long *Wrangling Polemick* of the *Learned*. That who think otherwise of the *Holy Trinity* of *God* than of this *Trinity* of the *Queen* may be Silenced!

And to make this your *Emblem* of the *Holy Trinity* more *Apposite*, you tell his *Lordship* in the next Words, that her Majesty has been lately *Graciously Pleased* to Drop one of her *Personalities*, by the *Union* of *England* and *Scotland*. So that she is now but *Two Persons*, one for *Great Britain*, and one for *Ireland*. So that if the *Personalities* be no more *Essential* in the *Deity*, than in the *Queen*, as you say they are not, then these *Personalities* in the *Godhead* may be Dropt too in *Time*, which you Hope, and have thus Endeavour'd to bring to pass!

(8.) If *Persons* were Answerable for *Dedications* to them, or suppos'd to see them before, or to Approve them afterwards, or to Patronize such Books inscrib'd to their Names, what a Terrible Reflection wou'd it be to these two Noble *Lords* under whose Protection Mr. Clendon has Presumed to Usher his Book into the World?

And no doubt the Piety of the *Queen* (if she knew of this Book) would Resent with Indignation that Blasphemous *Em-*

blem made of Her and her three Imaginary Persons, to the Holy Trinity of the most High God!

(9.) But, Mr. Clendon, tell me, Could one of these Persons of the Queen be a Maid, another a Wife, and another a Widow? Could her Person in England have a Son, and her Person in Scotland have None? I ask this, because it fully Explains your Emblem of the Holy Trinity. For by Persons you mean (with Sabellius) only several Manifestations of God: And you might make three Thousand or three Hundred Thousand of such Persons, for every Act of God is a Manifestation of God; and shews His Power, Wisdom, &c. every Star in Heaven, and every Pile of Grass, every Man, Bird, Beast, Fish, &c. In short, every Creature. And you might Multiply the Persons of the Queen into as many Countries, Parishes, Families, or Men, as the Commands: And into as many Variations of her Phys, Meen, Dress, &c. as you please to Imagin: Then add the many Endowments of her Mind: Then all her Honours, Dignities, Offices, &c. all which you make several Personalities, and you may make as many Persons of her, as Hobbs does of his Leviathan!

(10.) But now, Mr. Clendon, I must mind you of your Philosophy again. For a Manifestation is Nothing of it self, it is only a Word whereby to Express our Conception of the thing that is Manifested to us. Thus your several Persons of the Queen, are only several Manifestations of her Power in several Places, and in different Manners. And this is all you make of the Persons of God. But, Sir, a Manifestation, as it is no Person, so it can do no Personal Action. A Manifestation cannot Eat and Drink, Marry and beget Children. It cannot Send or be Sent of an Errand. Was it only a Manifestation then that was made Flesh, that was Sent of God to do such things upon Earth, to Suffer, Die, and be Buried? Was it the Blood of a Manifestation only that is call'd the Blood of God? Act. xx. 28. Are we Baptiz'd into the Faith and Worship of Manifestations only, that is, of Nothing but Imaginations of our own, or the Conceptions of our Mind? For God is not Named in the Christian Form of Baptism, but only the three Persons, which you call Manifestations only. Do you not Worship then your own Imaginations? For you can make nothing else of Manifestations. And is it

it not Strange that Christ should Command us to be Baptiz'd in the Name of Manifestations only, without a Word of the Person that was Manifested to Us? And this must be, if what Mr. Clendon calls the Manifestations were not the Persons of the Deity.

(11.) But he calls them Persons too. For he cannot, (through the Multitude of his Philosophy) find out the Difference betwixt the Actor and the Action done by him, but calls the Action the Actor or the Person that Acts. He says p. 181. That the Apostles Creed, doth plainly assign the Personality of the Father to be the Maker of Heaven and Earth.

Why? Mr. Clendon, was He not a Person before? Or did He become a New Person by the Creation He made? And where does the Creed call this His Personality? Your Assurance is not a Little!

You say, p. 180. And the Act of our Redemption must surely be the Personality of the Son. But was He not a Person before that Act? Else how could He do it? Or did He change His Person by that Act? Then it was not the same Person that Died who Rose again, for Death makes a greater Alteration in the Person than any of these Personalities

you have Named, of Phiz or Dress, &c.

But you go on and say, p. 181. of the third Person, And the gracious Act of our Sanctification must be the Personality of the Holy Ghost. Then He was not the Holy Ghost before. But you make these three Acts of Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification, the several Personalities of God, as you say, p. 183. The Personalities of Creation and Redemption, &c. And you Explain what you mean by Personalities, that is, only Manifestations of God, as you say, p. 181. The one true God, under these three gracious Manifestations of himself, in our Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification. And p. 186. These External Acts of our Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification, are taken for the Personalities. And p. 188. These Personalities are Extra Essentialities. What are they then? Are they Accidentalities? No, (say you *ibid*) There are no Accidents in God. Where are we now? What? Are they neither Essentialities nor Accidentalities? You say they are Modalities. And what are these Modalities? You say, It is and must be Agreed in all Philosophical Reasoning, that Accidents, Adjuncts, and whatsoever doth Modify Essence, must be Extrinsic to the Essence Modified. Then these Modalities are:

are something less than *Accidents*. They are Nothing but a *Thought* in our Brain of the Manner how an *Accident* does *Modify* an *Essence*. Of which we know not one Tittle. For an *Accident* it self is only the like *Imagination* of ours, That because we find ther are things *Hard* or *Soft*, therefore we *Fancy* such a thing as *Hardness* or *Sofiness*, and so Discourse of these *Words* as if they were *Real Things*. And these we call *Accidents*, which in Them-selves are *Nothing* at all. And if *Accidents* are *Nothings*, what are the *Modalities* of *Accidents*? These must be *Nothing* of *Nothing*! And if ther are no *Accidents* in *God*, how can ther be *Modalities* of *Accidents* in Him?

We see now to what Mr. Clendon has brought the *Persons* of *God*, by his *Philosophy*, to be *Nothings* and less than *Nothing*! Is not this *Philosophy* of his very *Charming* and *Edifying*! O happy *Clubb* where these *Lectures* are daily Read!

(12.) But I must not Conceal the Reason he gives for all this *Jargon*. You have it p. 188. For that there ought to be some *Analogy* between the *Divine Personalities*, and *Personalities among Men*. Here is what I have so often told the *Soci-ans*, that they will Measure

God by *Man*, and His *Persons* by our *Persons*, because we have no *Words* that are *Proper* whereby to Express *God*, but all Borrowed from *Terms* we use as to one another. Hence they bring all their *Contradictions* as to the *Trinity*, from what the *Words* will bear in Relation to *Men*. And yet in this they fall into *Contradictions* in their own way. As Mr. Clendon in this same Page 188. There are no *Accidents* in *God* (says he) But nevertheless these *Acts* that I propose to be the *Personalities*, and to *Constitute* the *Divine Persons*, are *Sufficiently Analogous* to the *Personalities among Men*, in that they are *Extra Essential* as the *Personalities among Men* are. First, it is not so among *Men*. For the *Personality* of a *Man* is *Essential* to the *Man*, that is, he is a *Person* by the Union of his *Soul* and *Body*, and when these are Separated, he is no more that *Person*. This is the *Acceptation* of a *Person* among *Men*, in all *Common Sense*, and as *Generally Understood*. And your making the Change of a *Wigg* or a *Coat* to be putting on a *New Person*, is most *Ridiculous*, notwithstanding all your *Philosophy*.

(13.) But you have made it thus, that, by way of your *Analogy*, you might make the *Per-sons*

sons of God to be *Accidents* like the other, nay, meer *Modalities* of Accident, that is, the *Nothing* of *Nothing*! And tho' you say there are no *Accidents* in God, yet you say, *Nevertheless* His Persons are *Extra-Essential*, that is, *Accidents*! And cannot you see so Stancing a *Contradiction* as this! Usher'd in with a *Nevertheless*, that tho' it be so, it shall not be so! And why? That the *Personalities* which you Propose to *Constitute* the *Divine Persons*, may be *Sufficiently Analogous* to the *Personalities* among *Men*!

(14.) But yet, Mr. Clendon, you will not Suffer others to use any *Analogous Expressions*, or to call *Christ* the *Son of God*, or the *Natural Son of God*, to Distinguish Him from *Sons* by *Adoption* as we are Call'd in a larger Sense. No. But you *Inveigh* against those, Who (say you) methinks almost to a degree of *Profaness*, call God the *Natural Father* of our *Saviour*, and our *Saviour* the *Natural Son of God*, as if the *Deity* did *Propagate* after the *Manner of Men*. Thus you, p. 179. As if ther could be no *Analogy*, unless God did directly *Paopagate* after the *Manner of Men*! This is the *Super-Finens* of the *Socinians*, and their *Sagacity* beyond all other sort of *Disputants*! It is said *Luk.*

iii. 38. Which was the Son of Enos, which was the Son of Seth, which was the Son of Adam, which was the Son of God. Did God therefore Beget Adam, just as Seth begat Enos? Else it wou'd not be (as you call it) *Sufficiently Analogous* to the *Personalities* among *Men*! O my dear Father Clendon!

(15.) Opening you Book by Chance just now, I find another Sort of *Personalities* which I did not take Notice of before, that is, the *Personality* of *Ubi*, or *Locality*, that a Man becomes a Different Person from every New Place he is in. And from hence (say you at the end of p. 160.) results the different *Personality* of *John at Noke* from *John at Style*. But if *John* committed a Robbery at *Noke*, wou'd you Hang *John at Style* for it? For tho' it is the same Man, yet it is not the same Person! Or cou'd you Hang the Man and save the Person? Come, Mr. Clendon, you are a Lawyer (or should be) you have Considered the *Classical* and *Philosophical* Meaning of the word *Person*, what think you of the *Legal*? If you were a Judge, how wou'd you Correct the Silly Manner us'd of giving Evidence? When a Country Fellow came into Court at *Noke*, and swore that the Prisoner at the Bar did Rob him at *Style*, and that

this was the same *Person*: How would you Rebuke the Ignorance of that Clown, and tell him it was not the same *Person*, for the *Man* was now in another *Obi*, and had left the other *Person* behind him! How *Mazed* would the poor Bellow look, and Run back to *Style* to find the *Person* that Robbed him! This brings me to Ask from you, Mr. Clendon, what becomes of all the Dead *Personalities*? for since a *Man* Changes his *Person* every *Step* he takes, ther must be an Infinite Number of these cast-off *Persons* in the World! And what becomes of them? Are they *Nothings*, or *Somethings*? Are they *Substance*, *Adjuncts*, *Accidents*, or *Modalities*? Let this be the Subject next *Clubb-Night*. And add, That since *God* has *Ubiquity*, and is in every *Place*, how many *Personalities* He must have? And why then He should be Confined to three *Persons* only! Your *Philosophy* will make Work with this! And let the Result of your *Divan* be sent to the *Tattler*, that he may Publish it to the World. For he is Acquainted with your *Clubb*.

(16.) If you think this making too *Merry* with your *Mastership*, I must tell you, it is as *Serious* as all your *Philosophy*; which Plays a thousand

Monkey Tricks, but like that Grave *Animal* keeps his *Countenance* when he shews his *Naked*—Climbing up the *Porphyry Tree*. Your *Dumfounding* pleases you mightily, and tho' upon a *Serious Subject*, you bring it in often, p. 27. 111. 163. &c. It is *Toutful* and *Gay*, and I suppose makes a good *Jest* at the *Trumpet*! To see *Children Play* is a *Diversion*: But to see an *Old Man* bestride a *Hobby-Horse* has something *Monstrous* in it! And yet (as you say well p. 110) we see how *Big* some *Men* Look, and even in their *Elder Years* value *Themselves* upon their *Skill* in this Sort of *Theology*, which is in *Truth* vain *Philosophy*.

(VIII.) But I have not done with you yet, Mr. Clendon. To Compleat your *Banter* upon the Holy *Trinity*, you have founded it upon an *Act of Parliament* of 9 and 10. *Will. III.* Better to you than a hundred *Councils* to settle *Points of Faith*! And you call your Book an *Exposition* of this *Act of Parliament*—That you might keep within the *Verge* of your own *Profession*. It had been better for you if you had. But you would be *Good* at something!

(1.) You say, p. 223. "The
" *Explication* therefore of these
" *Words Person* and *Personality*,
to

“ to such a Sense as was In-
 “ tended by this *Act of Par-*
 “ *liament*, is what I have Ex-
 “ plicated in this Discourse—
 “ It is an old Saying, *Vox*
 “ *Populi, Vox Dei*, which if it
 “ ever be true, must be so
 “ of our most August *Parli-*
 “ *amentary Assembly*— And
 “ there is no doubt, but the
 “ same *Holy Spirit* that guided
 “ the Pens of our Inspired
 “ Writers, did Conspire with
 “ our *Legislators* in making
 “ this Law.

(2.) But that we may not
 mistake what you, Sir, mean
 by our *Legislators*, you Ex-
 plain it in the forgoing Page,
 p. 222. where you say, *That*
it was high time for our LAY-
LEGISLATION to take the
Master in Hand. Here you take
 Care to Exclude the *Bishops*
 from having any Share or Con-
 cern in Settling the Doctrine
 of the *Holy Trinity*. If they
 had been Included, you would
 not have Attributed to the
Parliament such a Direction of
 the *Holy Spirit* as was given
 to the *Pen-Men* of the *Holy*
Scriptures.

(3.) The Church of *Rome*
 never did or could Assert the
Infallibility of her *Popes* or
Councils in an Higher Strain
 than this. And if this Gentle-
 man's Word went for any

thing, their Argument against
 us would be Un-Answerable.
 That ours is a *Parliamentary*
Religion.

(4.) But I suspect him not
 of *Popery*, tho' he thus favours
 it. I rather think he is a
Deist, and serves that Cause
 not a little, in making our *Par-*
liament (but without the *Bi-*
shops) to be *Infalible*, and the
 Foundation of our *Faith*, even
 in the *Holy Trinity*! Who sees
 not this to be a *Banter* upon
Religion, Church, and Parlia-
ment?

(5.) He pleads for his No-
 tion of the *Trinity*, as being
 now a *Law*, since the 9 and 10
 of *Will. III.* And says p. 223.
This is what our Act of Parlia-
ment hath rightly Established for
Law, and not to be denied. And
this it hath done with a Lenity pe-
culiar to LAY-LEGISLATION.
No dreadful ANATHEMA do-
nounc'd &c. Here again he Ex-
 cludes the *Bishops*, they must
 have no Hand in any Good
 thing! *Lenity* is *Peculiar* to
Lay-Legislation! And was it not
 great *Lenity* that this *Lay Le-*
gislation did not Denounce *Ana-*
themas? No doubt he thinks
 they have as much Right to
 do it as all the *Bishops* in
 the World! For it is *Vox Pe-*
puli, that is, *Vox Dei* with him;
 and the Rather because it was
 the

the *Voices* of the *People* that Prevaile, when they Cryed *Crucify*.—

(6.) It is high time therefore (says he, p. 218.) for *Us*, of the *Lazy I* mean, to Think for our selves, and not depend upon those *Scanty Guides* (of the *Clergy*) for our *Instruction* in *Matters* of so great *Importance*.

(7.) But he is very Civil to the *Church* of *England*, all this *Notwithstanding* ! For he makes *Her*, as well as the *Parliament*, to Teach the same *Doctrine* as to the *Trinity* that he has set down. And, on that Account, would fain Complement her out of the *Catholick Church*. He Opposes them to each other, and takes Part with the *Church* of *England*. He says, p. 194. *The Catholick Church, the Catholick Doctrine, is the usual Dialect they talk in. And why not the Church of England, I'd fain know ? Then he Prefers what he calls her Doctrine* (that is, his own) to that of the *Catholick Church*. And says, p. 195. *Her purer Faith and Doctrine have the Holy Scriptures for their Authority, and the Laws of England for their Establishment. The highest Sanction that can be given by Human Power. What, Mr. Clendon, Higher than the San-*

ction of the *Government* in any other Country ? But you only mean Higher than any *Ecclesiastical Sanction* of all *Councils* or *Bishops*, tho' of the whole Earth ; For you have Declar'd your self to be only for *Lay-Legislations*, tho' in *Matters* or *Faith* or *Doctrine*. You go over again this of Distinguishing the *Church* of *England* from the *Catholick Church*, p. 183. 186. 216. 218. &c. You thought this a *Pure Touch*, to Persuade her to Depend for her *Faith* upon the *Sanction* only of an *Act* of *Parliament* !

(8.) But after all, the Words in that *Act* are found Words, and the *Penalties* are against any who shall deny any one of the *Persons* in the *Holy Trinity* to be *God*. And the *Directions* you Mention (p. 1.) to the *Bishops* are, That none shall presume to deliver any other *Doctrine* concerning the *Blessed Trinity* than what is Contained in the *Scriptures*. And where will you find there your *Quoddities* and *Quiddities*, your *Modalities* and *Personalities* ? So that you have Manifestly gone against these *Directions*. And you have *Philosophized* the *Persons* in the *Holy Trinity* into meer *Manifestations*, which are no *Persons* at all. And therefore have Directly Incurred all the *Penalties*

nalities in that *Act of Parliament*.

(9.) And for the Church of England, she *Abhors* and *Detests* as *Heretical* your *Wild Opinions*. Do you not know that both the *Nicene* and *Athanasian Creeds* (which you *Battle*) are in her *Liturgy*, and that every Word of that *Liturgy* is Confirmed by *Act of Parliament*?

Does not the *Second Article* of the Church of England Declare that *The Son which is the Word of the Father, begotten from Everlasting of the Father, the Very and Eternal God of one Substance with the Father, took Man's Nature, &c.* And do you not expressly Deny the *Eternal Generation* of the *Son*, or that He had any *Existence* (besides *Ideal* in the *Divine Intellect*, as all other *Creatures* had) before his *Incarnation*? This you Assert, p. 169, 170, and 211.

Do you not know that the Church of England owns the *four first General Councils*, which Establish those *Doctrines* you have Disputed against? And they were long after *Adrian*, since which Time you bid *Adieu* to the true Faith and the *Cathelick Church*.

(10.) You are Sunk below *Arianism*, into the very Dregs of *Socinianism*, you allow the *Son of God* no *Existence* with His Father before He took

our Nature upon Him in the Womb of the Blessed *Virgin*.

And betwixt *Socinianism* and *Deism* the Partition is very thin, as betwixt that and *Atheism*. Of which your *Parliamentary Infallibility*, equal to that of the *Holy Scriptures*, Smells very Rank. It is directly Denying the *Divine Authority* of the *Holy Scriptures*, which comes Expressly under the *Penalties* of that *Act* you have Chosen for your Text. As likewise your *Bantering St. John*, that he was not a *Match* for the *Philosophers*, and yet that the *Poor Old Man* must Write! And that he borrow'd his Notion of the *Logos* or *Word of God* from *Plato*, and you make it Meer *Heathenism*. Is not this Denying the *Christian Religion* to be True? Which is another *Article* in that *Act*. And what *Christian Religion* do you think they Meant? Only that before *Adrian*? And what *Catholick Church* is it which the Church of England Prays for Daily in her *Liturgy*? Is it that which has been Extinct ever since *Adrian*?

This is Mr. Clendon's first Offence against this *Act*, that is, in *Print*. And the *Penalty* of that (as he sets it down, p. 2.) is, to be *Incapable of any Office or Employment*. But this will do Mr. Clendon little Hurt, who is better known in *Sheer-Lane* than in *Westminster-Hall*.

And if they leave him but his Office of Reader at the Trumpet to Propagate his Religion, he is in his Kingdom!

(11.) But to Compleat his CHARACTER he lets us know that he is a Whigg too. But that is no great News, for all Deists are so; I will not say all Whigs are Deists, but the Exceptions are not Many, and I will not be bound to Name them. He brings High and Low Church into this Dispute, p. 216. And speaking of those who Adhere to the Primitive and Catholick Church, he says, Surely they must be the HIGH CHURCH that is so much talk'd of. Then he brings in those whose Doctrine is Authenticated by the Laws of the Land, and calls these Our Mother the Church of England, and says, these must be the LOW CHURCH. If they gave him a Fee to Plead thus for them, he has well Deserv'd it!

(12.) But he Singles out some to Commend more Especially, those particularly who have had the Honour to be Suspected of Socinianism. He says, p. 201, 202. That Dr. Tillotson, the Late Excellent Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, the Good Man was Ruffled upon, because he was so Ingenious as to own the SOCINIAN Writers to be Fair and Civil Adversaries, and to Argue with Smartness and Subtily, &c. And he says, That

these Catholick Church Men had their Fling at the Late Pious and Learned Bishop of Ely, Dr. Patrick, for the first Part of his WITNESSES TO CHRISTIANITY.

But he spends from p. 202 to p. 207. Upon the present Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, his Grace, who (says Mr. Clendon) in his younger Time wrote a most Excellent Discourse of IDOLATRY, which he goes on Explaining to p. 207. where he says, And his Grace tells us further, that they who stily oppos'd the Ministration of the λόγος or Son, gave Suspicion to Jealous Heads, as if they looked towards RACOVIA. Then adds, To come at this has been the Occasion of my Digression all this while; That I might take Notice that his Grace in those Days did Observe and was Aware of the then Common Calumny of SOCINIANISM, as well as others. And, Mr. Clendon, if you had thought there had been Nothing of it in those Words of his Grace, which you have been at so much Pains to Pick out, we had not heard of it from you. But you think these Words of his do look as if he stily Oppos'd the Ministration of the λόγος or Son of God, in the Creation of the World, and the Manifestations or Appearances of God in the Old Testament, particularly that upon Mount Sinai at the Giving of

of the Law, contrary to the Current of the Primitive Fathers. Only that as you say in the following Words, *His Grace Manag'd that Discourse with so much Learning and Caution, that he was Proof against all their Reproaches of that kind.* What Service you have done his Grace by this Vindication, I know not. But you think it for his Honour! And you are Fond of it, you are at him again, p. 212. and say, *As for the other Matter of the abys, delivering the Law to Moses, his Grace tells us it was Branded by Grotius for an Error.* Now to the Next. You go on p. 214.

" I will add but one Instance more touching this so frequent Calumny of Socinianism. The present Great and Learned Bishop of Sarum, because in his Discourse to his Clergy, and in his Exposition of the 39 Articles, he dropt some Expressions that were out of the Common Road of our Systematical Divines, how fiercely was he Attack'd by the Rector of *Kilminster* on the one hand, and the Examiner of his *Second Article* on the other, and by both Charged with *Socinianism*?

He says Nothing in Defence of this Good Bishop, but leaves him to Himself. And goes on to Lessen the Prejudices against *Socinianism*.

(13.) But to any who speak against *Socinianism*, you shall see how he keeps his *Patience* and spends his *Wit*! Thus he treats the Reverend Mr. *Hill* of *Kilminster*, p. 133. for his Daring to Oppose the Bishop of *Sarum* as to *Socinianism*, he says of him, *His Sour Crabbed Aspect, apparent in his Insolent and Abusive Language to that Great Bishop, whose Books he is not worthy to Carry after him—* The Old Man is Angry! But I must give you a whole Paragraph of his upon the same Subject, p. 134. because it is Singular for *Wit* and *Temper*, and Variety of Thought! Thus.

" Next, we have in his Looks and Lineaments, and Gravity of Feature, which speaks him Able for profound Theory and penetrating Thought, by which he can See as far into a *Mill-Stone* as any Man, and Comprehends the three *Hypostases* as well as those that lived Fourteen or Fifteen Hundred Years ago, or more. Add to this, that he has withal a Sharpness and Sagacity of *Phiz*, from whence he is able Craftily to Secrete and Conceal his three *Hypostases* under his Technical or Artificial Term, *Persons*. Thus is his Discourse a perfect Copy of his *Countenance*, and so doth truly signify his own *Person* (for you know *Phiz* is *Person*) I will

" will add but one Word further, and that is what the Gentleman says of himself in his Preface, (*viz.*) That these Points had then employ'd his Theories for above Seven and Twenty Years. Alas for him, Poor Gentleman! He spent his Time to good Purpose, did he not?

You are Cruel Sharp upon him, Mr. Clendon! Besides your *Hey-day, Hey-day*, which you often give as an Answer to his Arguments! as p. 129, &c. And was not his 27 Years as well spent, as if he had employ'd 70 to lose Common Sense in your Philosophy! But after all, his *Phiz* is better than your own, Mr. Clendon, and therefore he is a better Person by your Philosophy. And you come off the Severity of your Character, for p. 133; Just after his Sour Crabbed Aspect, you add, *But this is not without Somewhat of a Soft and Pleasing Air*. This was to shew how Sweet and how Sour you could be!

(14.) And as you Justifie the Bishop of Sarum again Mr. Hill with a *Hey-day*, so you Defend him against the Animadverter upon his Exposition of the 2d Article with a *Hah-ha-ha*. The Animadverter had own'd that there was a Mystery in the Trinity of God, at which you break out into a Loud Laugh, p. 153, and Cry *Ha, ha, ha!* Is it come to

this at last? As you say, p. 194, *We must not be fobb'd off with Mystery*. You have made the Trinity of God as Plain as that of the Queen, without any Mystery at all in it! And all this by your Wonderful Account of the Word Person!

(IX.) But, Mr. Clendon, You have made no Discovery with all your Pains. For who knows not that the Word Person (like other Words) may be taken in Different Senses? That Orators and Logicians speak not in the same Strictness of Terms? Yet from Cicero you wou'd Confute the Schools! In whose Restrained Sense you take those Words which were in Use before such Restraint or Limitation was put upon them. Thus the *Hypostasis* among the Greeks was not Understood with respect to the after Niceties of Substance, Subsistence, &c. Upon which you Ring all your Changes, and would Infer Trithemism from the three Hypostases. Tho' you cannot Deny but that they Sufficiently Declared themselves against it. And again, the Broaching of fresh Heresies still occasion'd more and more Restriction of the Sense of Words relating to those Questions, to New and Different Meanings.

(X.) And no Man takes greater Latitude in this Matter than your self. As at the End of p. 109, and Beginning of

p. 110. Where you come to Answer that Text Col. ii. 9. *In Him (Christ) dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead bodily.* You say p. 110. *I cannot but think there is more Rhetorick than Metaphysicks imply'd in the Phraseology, and that a Metaphor from House-dwelling was plainly Intended.* This was to bring it to the Socinian Notion, That God the Word was not Made Flesh (as it is said Joh. 1. 14) or took our Nature upon Him, but only that He Dwelt in Flesh, in the Person of the Man Jesus, as a Man Dwells in an House, which makes not the Man to be the House, nor the House to be the Man. And this will make Christ to be no more God than any Prophet or Apostle or other Good Man, in whom God, by His Holy Spirit, is said to Dwell. I will Grant you that the Word Dwelling or In-Dwelling is here a Metaphor. But, Sir, the Strefs lies in the Word Fulness, and to pursue the Metaphor, if you could find an House or Habitation which could Contain all the Fulness of the Godhead, that House would be God, because Nothing that is not Infinite can Contain Infinite. And therefore such Expression was never Used of any Prophet or Apostle, or of any Angel in Heaven, but of Christ our Lord only.

But when you are Pinched here, you come off with Cal-

ling this only a Piece of Rhetorick! And yet at the same time you will Allow no Latitude for the Word *Hypostasis* or Person, as differently Understood at several Times, but Restrain them to the Modern Niceties of the Schools: And yet you Battle these with the Latitude used by Orators, who you are sensible did not Oblige themselves to that Strictness of Phraseology as the Philosophers and Logicians. So that you play Fast and Loose. Sometimes you are upon the High Rope, and Nothing can stop your Swing; Then Phraseology and Rhetorical Solves the most Express Texts can be brought against you! At other times you straiten the Terms to the Utmost Rigour and Dance all your Changes upon them, and give them different Airs as they make For or Against you! Your whole Book and all the Philosophy in it is Nothing but Playing with Words. Which if they may be Understood in the Plain and Common Acceptation, as Used by all the World, and in all other Matters; the Socinians must give up the Cause, and yield to those Many and Express Texts of Holy Scripture, which Assert the Divinity of Christ, and the Adorable Trinity of God. And were so Understood by those to whom the Apostles deliver'd these Doctrines by Word of Mouth, as well as in Writing, and who therefore were most Capable to Know their true Meaning; and who Delivered down these Doctrines to the after Ages of the Church, which are still Retained in all
Christian

Christian Churches to this Day. All which I hope I have made fully Appear in the foregoing *Dialogues*. And that it will appear more Plain to all Judicious Readers, upon the Detection of these poor *Shifts* made Use of by the Adversaries to the *Christian Doctrine*. And which they confess they never would have made use of, nor would have Thought of them, but for the Seeming *Contradictions* they Apprehended were Contained in these *Doctrines*. And therefore were Forced to Struggle with all their Wit against the Plain very Plain *Revelation* of them in the Holy *Scriptures*, so Plain, that they themselves do own, they would have Received them as the *Christian Church* does, and has done from the Beginning, but for the *Contradiction* they Conceived in them. And that for this only Cause they have put those *Constrained Meanings* upon the *Words* of the *Scriptures*, in this Matter only, and Different from the Use of these *Words* upon any other Subject whatsoever. And likewise after having in vain Attempted to Gain to their Side the Primitive *Fathers* before the first *Council* of Nice, now Lastly, as Mr. Clendon does, to throw off *Fathers* and *Councils* and all *Church Evidence* or Authority. And this their Notion of *Contradiction* in these *Divine Mysteries*, arising Meerly from their Applying to God the *Words* used among Men (for we can understand none other) and that Strictly and Properly as belonging

to Men, and in this Sense Adapting them to God, and Measuring the Infinite by our Finite Nature; for this Reason I began my *Dialogues* with Removing this *Objection*, and shewing the Unreasonableness (and in several Instances there Produced) of Interring a *Contradiction* in a Nature we do not Understand, from the like being a *Contradiction* in another Nature which we do Understand. This was Battled in the *Remarks* upon my first *Dialogue*. But I hope it has stood its Ground in the *Defences* I have Made. And the More, for that after all this Contest, they cannot now shew any *Contradiction*, but in this same Method I have Detected, and which I have Forced the *Remarker* himself to Confess is most Unreasonable and Absurd. And yet they still Stick to it! Tho' at the same time they Deny it, which is Giving up the Argument. For it is Apparent. Because they cannot (after all the Provocations given them) find out any other Way to shew a *Contradiction* in these *Doctrines*. And they have Labour'd it with all their Skill, but cannot find it. And I think no Cause can be Reduced or Detected to a greater Degree than this, for it is Proving against them out of their own Mouths!

I hope now I have Ended my Labour upon this most-Important Subject. If I have said any thing to Confirm the Faith, the Glory is to God. And let my Infirmities be Excused, that I could do it no Better.

FINIS.

